

State of New Jersey
RFP for PAMS
Addendum #3

1. In order to help ensure that we are in full compliance with the RFP, please detail the nature of the protest of the previous award and why it was upheld.

Answer: The protest for the previous award of PAMS dealt with material deviations, including

- failure to provide the required financial documentation;
- failure to identify and include the Oracle software licensing costs in the cost proposal; and,
- inclusion of warranty language that conflicted with the RFP's warranty requirements.

2. With regard to the RFP schedule listed at the bottom of page 2, will the bidders' prices be announced publicly, as is the norm in the State of New Jersey, on December 15, 2004 at 4:00PM?

Answer: No. Page 2 (xi) of the "Attention PAMS Bidders" cover page states, in part, "...The contents of each bidder's bid proposal, including information exchanged during negotiations, will remain confidential prior to contract award."

3. On page 36, Section 1.2.2.5, how many users are estimated for DLGS?

Answer: For purposes of submitting a proposal, assume 25 users (estimated) of PAMS at DLGS.

4. On page 36, Section 1.2.2.6, how many certified Tax Collectors are estimated for the 566 municipalities in New Jersey?

Answer: This information is not readily available, and would need to be compiled. Regardless of whether a Tax Collector is certified or not, both they and their staff will be users of the PAMS system. Therefore, for purposes of submitting a proposal, refer to Section 3.4 of the RFP, page 66, first paragraph, which states: "When fully implemented, PAMS must be capable of being deployed for use by approximately 100 State level employees, 80 county tax board employees, 1100 assessors and staff, and 1100 collectors and staff. The system architecture must be capable of supporting gradual growth in the maximum number of concurrent users." Bidders are reminded that the hardware, software and software licenses that are included in the price sheets submitted with the proposal must be sized to support production for the initial three counties and the system test, integration test and training environments, although those environments can be shared. The database must be sized to accommodate the entire state since historical data for all 21 counties will be loaded during conversion. However, the bidder must specify in its proposal the hardware, software and software licensing requirements that will be required by the State to support a full production environment, including any formulas or metrics that the State can use to plan for the necessary upgrades as the remaining 18 counties are added and the full user base is attained.

5. On page 37, Section 1.2.3.2, should vendors address all "Inefficiencies" described in this section?

Answer: Section 1.2.3.2 was provided as background material (Current Systems Overview) for the benefit of potential bidders. Information in that section, including current inefficiencies, was taken into account to develop the requirements that are contained in the RFP. Since bidders must respond to the requirements of the RFP, by so doing, they will also be addressing the inefficiencies that were cited.

6. On page 37, Section 1.2.3.3, the last sentence in that section references standard and ad hoc reports. Can the State define or provide examples of "standard" or normal reports currently required by "various State departments and agencies"?

Answer: Reports that are required are included as part of the functional requirements of the RFP (Section 3.3 and Exhibits F, G and J).

7. Page 38, Section 1.4.2. Please clarify and define what is to be classified as official Addenda (e.g. is email considered official Addenda)?

Answer: Addenda to the RFP are issued by the Purchase Bureau (i.e. the assigned buyer) and will be communicated by e-mail for this procurement.

8. Page 39, Section 1.4.6. Will items marked as "confidential", for security reasons (in accordance with conditions defined under OPRA laws), regarding designs, security framework, and/or network functionalities be acceptable and eligible for protection within a bidders proposal response?

Answer: Per page 1 of the RFP, "Attention PAMS Bidders", item (xiv), the entire process is open for inspection after award, subject to any confidentiality that attaches by virtue of federal or state law, including New Jersey's Open Public Records Act (OPRA), and the common law. That being said, the State cannot state in advance how it will treat a particular section of a proposal that the bidder marks "confidential."

9. Page 40, Section 2.0, Could the State confirm or verify the current number of certified MOD IV data centers within the State?

Answer: 14. See RFP Section 1.2.3.2.

10. Page 42, Section 3.0. The first sentence refers to a "real time" system. Please define in detail the term "real-time".

Answer: In the context of the RFP, "real time" means a system that both retrieves data as currently stored on the database(s), and that updates the database immediately after a transaction has been entered. The primary implication is that users of the system are accessing the most current data and that transactions are not saved, then applied, as part of a batch process.

11. Throughout Section 3.2 of the RFP, a list of required deliverables is included for the PAMS project. These deliverables are referenced in Section 3.2.1 (page 45), Section 3.2.1.1 (page 45), Section 3.2.2 (page 47), Section 3.2.3 (page 48), Section 3.2.4 (page 48), Section 3.2.5 (page 49), Section 3.2.6 (page 50), Section 3.2.7 (page 52), Section 3.2.8 (page 55), Section 3.2.9 (page 55), Section 3.2.10 (page 57), Section 3.2.11 (page 58), Section 3.2.12 (page 59), Section 3.2.13 (page 59), and Section 3.2.14 (page 60).

Does the State require the bidder to include an example of the listed deliverables in these sections?

Answer: Providing examples of deliverables (that are listed in Section 3 of the RFP) are at the discretion of the bidder, unless the RFP states that the bidder "must" or "shall" provide an example of a specific deliverable in their proposal. Nonetheless, bidders are encouraged to provide examples of as many deliverables as possible, regardless of whether they're required, since this level of detail will help the evaluation committee to understand, from a practical standpoint, how the bidder plans to actually complete the scope of work.

Does the State have a preferred format or samples for each of the required deliverables?

Answer: No, but as part of managing the project, the State Project Manager will review and approve the proposed format for each deliverable, since deliverables are the basis upon which milestones are achieved and payments made to the successful bidder.

What constitutes approval for key deliverable documents for each stage of the PAMS project, i.e., is formal signoff from the State required)?

Answer: Formal signoff from the State.

Who is responsible for any signoff that may be required?

Answer: The State's Project Manager, after consulting with appropriate members of the State's Project Team, will approve all deliverables. Based on that approval, the Project Sponsor (the Division of Taxation) will process payment(s) to the successful bidder in accordance with the payment schedule contained in the RFP.

12. Page 44, Section 3.2.1, 9th paragraph. This paragraph states, "in the event the State is unable to review and/or respond to any deliverable, the State will inform the contractor of such in writing". In what timeframe should the contractor anticipate to receive the State's written notice?

Answer: Before expiration of the "Maximum Business Days to Review" period.

13. Page 51, Section 3.2.7.2: For the three pilot counties, how many different vendor formats currently exist for MOD IV, CAMA, and Revenue data?

Answer: MOD IV is a State system, not a vendor system. The format for MOD IV is included in Exhibits 9E1 and 9E2 of the RFP.

To the best of the State's knowledge, municipalities in the three pilot counties use CAMA systems provided by either MicroSystems or Vital Computer.

Six (6) different vendors provide collections systems in the three pilot counties: United Computer, Municipal Software, Masterson, Edmunds, CSI and Vital.

The State anticipates that the State Municipal Liaison Team will validate the CAMA and Collections systems being used by each municipality as part of coordinating the PAMS project with them.

14. Page 55, Section 3.2.9: What is the State's preferred document repository/management system for project/technical documentation?

Answer: The State does not have a preferred document repository/management system. Per RFP Section 3.2.9, the State is requiring the documentation to use a web-based strategy so that document access can be accomplished using a browser. However, as the State will ultimately be responsible for maintaining this documentation, source documents in an established, widely used format such as MS Word or Adobe PDF would be preferable to proprietary solutions.

15. Page 63, Section 3.3.3.2: For the GIS component, if a vendor proposes to utilize the existing State GIS infrastructure described on page 15 of Exhibit 9H to fulfill the GIS requirements of the RFP, should the hardware and software costs associated with it be included in the price sheets?

Answer: All hardware, software, licensing and services required for the bidder's solution to operate and meet the requirements of the RFP, must be provided by the bidder and included in its proposal, except for those products discussed in Section 4.4.4 of the RFP that can be provided by the State.

16. RFP page 65, Section 3.4, "Requirements", paragraph 2, "Access to PAMS...PAMS security must be designed to accept from the portal a user who has already been authenticated." Does this requirement imply a 'single sign-on' requirement where the PAMS user should not be challenged with a user name/password logon screen if they have already logged on to the NJ portal? If so, can the State provide the specific names/versions of the Sun ONE Identity Management software that is currently in place? Exhibit H page 20 references the Sun One Identity Server but does not state any specific Sun Identity Management products, i.e., Access Manager, Directory Server Enterprise Edition, Identity Manager.

Answer: Yes. The software versions that will be part of the Identity and Access Management System expected to be in place in Feb/March of 2005 are:

- Sun Java System Access Manager 2004Q2
- Sun Java System Portal Server 6 2004Q2
- Sun Java System Directory Server 5 2004Q2

However, it is important to note that systems designed for access through the portal (version 6) will continue to use two custom identity management facilities that will ultimately be integrated into the Identity and Access Management Systems. They are as follows:

- (1) Authentication and authorization services are handled by a simple API that provides the following information about a user who logs in to the NJ Portal and then invokes an application such as PAMS:
- Does the user have a valid session?
 - Does the user have one or more of the roles required by the application?
 - What is the user's ID (primary key) in the context of the application?
 - Other optional information such as user name.

This API is directly available to Java applications and is also available via an XML interface for non-Java applications.

- (2) Delegated administrators use an interactive role management system within the NJ Portal to grant and revoke roles to and from application users. Batch loading of large numbers of users (such as prior to initial deployment of an application) is also available.

17. Page 70, Section 4.4.2.1.1: Can the qualifications and reference contacts requested in this section include both prime contractor and subcontractor(s) qualifications and reference contacts?

Answer: Yes, but the bidder must specify by name whether the prime contractor submitting the proposal or one of its subcontractors actually performed the work that being cited as a qualification to meet the minimum bidder experience.

Bidders are also reminded that they must provide additional relevant experience, per RFP Section 4.4.3.6. At least one reference (more if possible) must be provided for the firm submitting the proposal as well as for each subcontractor. The purpose of these references is to substantiate for the evaluation committee that each entity proposed to perform a role on the PAMS project has previously and successfully completed work of the same nature and complexity.

18. Page 71, Section 4.4.2.2, 3rd paragraph: How many municipalities are expected to be in the process of re-evaluation or re-assessment during the October through mid-December timeframe in 2006?

Answer: Historically, statistics reveal approximately 30 reassessments and 30 revaluations in an average year. Taking that into account, based on present orders to revalue and those assessors that are filing for a reassessment, the following estimate is provided for the three initial implementation counties in 2006.

	Revaluation	Reassessment
Camden	1	1
Hunterdon	2	6
Salem	1	1

19. RFP Section 4.4.3.7 requires a 15% bid bond and a written statement from a surety attesting that the surety will issue a performance bond to the bidder in the amount of 100% of the Total Bid Price if the bidder is awarded the PAMS contract. Our company is not in a position to provide for the bid bond and performance bond as asked for. While our company can stand to develop and implement a top quality system that will comply with every aspect of the technical requirements of the RFP at the cheapest price, such commercial terms make it impossible for us to even participate in the bidding process. We very much want to bid on this RFP and ask you to waive this bid bond and performance bond clause to ensure that small business enterprises such as us may also be able to compete.

Answer: The State maintains that the bid bond and performance bond requirements are an important component of this project. As such, the State will not waive these requirements. It is believed that any business possessing the financial and human resources to perform the scope of work for the PAMS project will be able to obtain the necessary bid bond and performance bond for this project.

20. Page 70, Section 4.4.10: Do contributions from the prime vendor satisfy the 134 requirements or do the subcontractors have to also indicate any contributions?

Answer: The prime contractor is responsible to be in compliance with Executive Order 134, and subcontractors are not.